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Of the Malay varieties of Southeast Asia, Papuan Malay is the most removed both geographically and linguistically from the "homeland" of Malay. While showing no more lexical differences than other Malay varieties, it represents an extreme divergence from the morphosyntax of the better-described varieties to the west. Verbs, and their place in clause structure, represent the area where this is most apparent, almost certainly representing influence from the Melanesian languages that were the native languages of the first speakers of an early variety of Papuan Malay.
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1. Introduction

This chapter discusses Papuan Malay, a variety of Malay spoken in the easternmost Indonesian province of Papua. The name is not unproblematic and is far from satisfactory; a more appropriate label might be "North(east) coastal Papuan Malay," since the corpus on which this description is based comes primarily from villages on the northeast coast of the Indonesian province of Papua, in western New Guinea, and the immediate hinterland. Earlier work on varieties of Malay in New Guinea includes Clouse (2001), Roosman (1982), Silzer (1979) and Suharno (1979), but, as with the current chapter, none of these presents survey-based justification for the delimitations of the varieties described.

There are in fact at least four main varieties of Malay/Indonesian spoken in New Guinea, though sociolinguistic research in this area is still in its infancy. The number of first-language speakers of any of the indigenous varieties of Malay spoken in New Guinea is not known but can be estimated at no less than a combined total of 100,000, and more likely several times this number.

Papuan Malay (in the sense used here) has at least 120 years of history behind it; it was probably initiated by the sporadic arrival of "Malay" bird of paradise traders in the nineteenth century, and later reinforced, and probably altered, by the presence of large number of speakers of Ambonese Malay (Donohue & Sawaki 2007; Grimes 1991). The linguistic traces of these outsiders are limited to the lexical in most inland villages (Seiler 1983 discusses Malay loans in languages spoken on the Indonesia/Papua New Guinea border; further east, words obviously related to
Malayu 'Malay', such as pisau 'knife' or beras 'rice', can be found east into the Serra hills and Torricelli ranges in Papua New Guinea). On the coast, however, a new lingua franca was added to the existing multilingual milieu. Papuan Malay in Indonesia has continued to be influenced by more western varieties of the language (some examples of these changes will be mentioned below), but a few villages across the border in Papua New Guinea (including Sko Tiau and Nyao) have retained the daily use of an earlier variety of Papuan Malay, allowing us a glimpse at a form of the language that has been less influenced by western elements in modern times.

Identifying and classifying different varieties of Malay/Indonesian is no simple matter (see, e.g., Adelaar & Prentice 1996). A language recognisable as a close ancestor of the modern languages is attested in rock inscriptions from the Srivijaya empire, dated to the seventh century AD, and numerous attestations since then show that the language was both politically important, and used in some form or another across a wide area. This has led to many diverse regional varieties with separate histories, bound together by standard languages that have been modelled on earlier, approximately sixteenth-century, formal language. The sociolinguistic complexities imposed by the sometimes great differences between the colloquial and formal languages are very fluid, and are only beginning to be properly understood (e.g., Manns forthcoming). Within this broader picture, we can unequivocally place Papuan Malay in the group of ill-defined "eastern" creoles that are found between Kupang and New Guinea; more specifically, we can link it, via lexical items (e.g., sambiki 'pumpkin', kelemarin 'yesterday'), to the varieties of Malay spoken in North Maluku and around Manado (Grimes nd; Taylor 1983; Voorhoeve 1983).

Research on Papuan Malay has been slow to extend past notes of lexical differences, but there is now a respectable literature on aspects of the variety and its likely near relatives, and ongoing work that serves to define the varieties of Malay in New Guinea (Kluge forthcoming; Scott et al. 2008). In this chapter, we shall focus on two areas in which Papuan Malay is most divergent from Standard Indonesian: complexification of the verb and the use of multiple verbs in a single clause in serial verb constructions, and the means by which multiple clauses are linked together. In both


Map 1. Some varieties of Malay/Indonesian spoken about Southeast Asia
these areas, the influence of substrate languages is apparent, in ways that are strikingly divergent from Standard Indonesian. In this chapter, I shall examine ways in which the morphological and syntactic options available for verbs show drastic differences between Papuan Malay, at the eastern edge of the area in which Malay/Indonesian is spoken, and Standard Indonesian, which represents a more conservative variety from the west of the range. While focusing on the structures of Papuan Malay, I shall contrast them with Standard Indonesian and with a local language, Skou (Donohue forthcoming).\(^1\)

2. Verbal complexification: Inflectional morphology

Verbal and clausal structures see the greatest concentration of non-western features in Papuan Malay, and apparently the greatest evidence of influence from a non-lexifier substrate.

The verbal system of Papuan Malay is one of the areas of the language’s grammar that shows the greatest divergence from the norms of western varieties of Malay, such as the homelands of the standard languages of Malaysia and Indonesia. Taking these varieties as base for comparison, examine the sentences in (1) to (4). While Standard Indonesian marks active and non-active voice on the verb by means of prefixes, Papuan Malay has no such marking (Donohue 2007a, 2007b). Even for those speakers who do have a voice contrast, that contrast is marked analytically, as in (4), rather than morphologically.\(^2\)

(1) *Anjing me-lihat babi.*
   dog    act-see pig
   ‘The dog saw the pig.’

(2) *Babi di-lihat (oleh) anjing.*
   pig    nonact-see by dog
   ‘The pig was seen by the dog.’

(3) *Anjing lia babi.*
   dog    see pig
   ‘The dog saw the pig.’

(4) *Babi dapa lia deng anjing.*
   pig    get    see with dog
   ‘The pig was seen by the dog.’

A feature that is saliently present in Papuan Malay, but absent in Standard Indonesian, is pronominal agreement. The preceding examples, with third-person non-human subjects, do not show agreement on the verb, but in the following examples this is an overt feature of the clause.

---

1. There are descriptions of other varieties of Malay closer to Papuan Malay (e.g., Van Minde 1997 on Ambonese Malay), but Malay varieties such as this also show clearly identifiable Papuan influences in their grammar (Donohue 2007c; Donohue & Schapper 2008).

2. Other morphological affixes that are productive in Standard Indonesian, such as *ber-* ‘middle voice’, *ter-* ‘accidental event’, or *-an* ‘abstract nominaliser’, are at best present in lexically fossilised form in Papuan Malay. They are not used productively.
Example (5) shows that pronominal information is present only in the form of a free pronoun in Standard Indonesian, while the Papuan Malay translation uses a clitic form of the pronoun on the verb; an independent pronoun (kita or saya, depending on dialect) is not grammatical within the clause (see Donohue & Sawaki 2007 for arguments on the clitic status of the bound pronouns in Papuan Malay).

(5)  
\[
\text{Saya me-lihat babi.}
\]
\[
1SG \text{ ACT-see pig}
\]
'I saw the pig.'

(6)  
\[
\text{Sa-lia babi.}
\]
\[
1SG=see pig
\]
'I saw the pig.'

While suffixation for subject agreement is the norm in New Guinea as a whole, subject prefixation is to be expected among the languages of the north coast. Example (7) shows translations of (6) in a selection of languages from along the northwest coast of New Guinea. While there is variation in the position of the object, some sort of prefixal agreement is very frequent. Example (8), showing the same sentence in Lani from the highlands, is more generally typical of the languages of New Guinea.

(7)  
\[
\text{a. Foro j-om-i.}
\]
\[
pig 1SG-see-3SG
\]
\[
\text{b. Pdie mi-fu.}
\]
\[
pig 1SG=see,F
\]
\[
\text{c. Y-eti fiai.}
\]
\[
1SG=see pig
\]
\[
\text{d. Sa-lia babi}
\]
\[
1SG=see pig
\]
'I saw a pig.'

(8)  
\[
\text{An wan k-eg-i-rak}
\]
\[
1SG pig 2/3SG=see 1SG-PAST
\]
'I saw a pig.'

The full set of Papuan Malay agreement clitics and the corresponding free pronouns are shown in Table 1. The pronouns of standard Indonesian are shown in Table 2; note that most of the pronouns in Papuan Malay can be related to the Standard Indonesian pronouns, with the addition of a regular pluralising -ong on the plural pronouns, related to orang 'person.' Table 2 also shows the independent and bound pronouns of Skou, a language spoken close to the "core" of the Papuan Malay area. As with Papuan Malay, the bound pronouns are transparently related to the independent pronouns. Note that Papuan Malay, like Skou and many Papuan languages, does not mark the contrast between inclusive and exclusive that is so typical of Austronesian languages.

---

3. A similar pluralising strategy is found in most non-standard varieties of Malay. This is probably related to the use of *lang* 'person' as a plural suffix on pronouns in Hokkien, a Chinese language that has influenced the development of Malay.
Table 1. Pronominal forms in Papuan Malay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>saya, kita</td>
<td>sa=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ko:</td>
<td>ko=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>dia, de</td>
<td>de=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>kitong, tong</td>
<td>tong=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>kam (kamo(ma)ng)</td>
<td>kam=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>dorang, dong</td>
<td>dong=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Basic pronounal forms in Standard Indonesian and Skou

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Indonesian</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG saya</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ni=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG engkau</td>
<td>mè</td>
<td>mè=m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG dia</td>
<td>NFR: ke; P: pe</td>
<td>NFR: ke=k-; P: pe=p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL ex: kam; IN: kita</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>ne=n-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL kalian</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL meroka</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te=t-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

including Indonesian (though see Donohue & Smith 1993). On the other hand, the marking of gender distinction in the third person, typical of northern New Guinea (Donohue 2000), is not found in Papuan Malay (though there are gender distinctions in some nouns, such as pace ‘male friend’, mace ‘female friend’, which are not found in Standard Indonesian).

Agreement for objects is also found in Papuan Malay, shown in (9), using the same set of clitics that can be used for subjects. Unlike subject agreement, which is obligatory for first or second persons and normal for (human) third persons, object agreement allows for more apparently unconditioned variation. Note that (10) is just as grammatical as (9), though it is not grammatical to have both the clitic and the free pronoun in the same clause.

(9) Babí=tu, de=lia=sá.
    pig=that 3SG=see=1SG
    ‘That pig, it saw me.’

(10) Babí=tu, de=lia kita.
    pig=that 3SG=see 1SG
    ‘That pig, it saw me.’

(11) *Babí=tu, de=lia-sá kita.
    pig=that 3SG=see=1SG 1SG
    ‘That pig, it saw me.’

The aspectual system of standard Indonesian, involving independent aspectual words, also shows very little structural relationship to the aspectual system of Papuan Malay. While the same etyma are used in many cases, in reduced form (so < sudah, mo < mau, tra < tidak), at least two markers of aspect in Papuan Malay have no exact correspondent, in either form or semantic match,
in Standard Indonesian. In both cases, the use of the verbs "taw" 'know' and "ada" 'be' as auxiliaries parallels the similar use of these lexical items as auxiliaries in local languages of north-central New Guinea; compare (26) and (27) (note that the Skou example shows the use of two auxiliaries, 'be' and 'do', which obligatorily co-occur in this construction). Only "masti" 'must,' also found in Ambonese Malay and corresponding to Standard Indonesian "mesti," is a phonologically separate word that is etymologically related to auxiliaries in more western varieties of the language. The semantic range of "masti" differs from "mesti," however, in that while "mesti" indicates obligation, "masti" indicates inevitability, a sense that is not available for Standard Indonesian, as can be seen in (28) and (29). The obligation sense is not unknown in Papuan Malay, but is more likely to be expressed without the use of "masti," as in (30) and (31).

**Standard Indonesian**

(12) *Dia sudah makan.*
3SG already eat
'She's already eaten.'

(14) *Dia mau makan.*
3SG want eat
'She wants to eat.'

(16) *Dia tidak makan.*
3SG not eat
'She didn't eat.'

(18) *Dia biasa makan.*
3SG usual eat
'She generally eats.'

(20) *Dia bisa makan.*
3SG able eat
'She can eat.'

(22) *Dia masih makan.*
3SG still eat
'She is still eating.'

(24) *Dia harus makan.*
3SG must eat
'She must eat.'

**Papuan Malay**

(13) *De=so=makan.*
3SG=already=eat
'She's already eaten.'

(15) *De=mo=makan.*
3SG=want=eat
'She wants to eat.'

(17) *De=tra=makan.*
3SG=not=eat
'She didn't eat.'

(19) *De=taw=makan.*
3SG=know=eat
'She usually eats.'

(21) *De=taw=makan.*
3SG=know=eat
'She can eat.'

(23) *De=ada=makan.*
3SG=be=eat
'She is eating.'

(25) *De=masti makan.*
3SG=must=eat
'She must eat.'

4. But note that "ada" as a marker of continuative aspect was used in earlier varieties of Malay and is attested in numerous Classical Malay texts. The verb is preserved in an auxiliary function in some western varieties, such as the following Singapore Pidgin Malay examples, but not with a continuative sense.

**Singapore Pidgin Malay**

(i) *diaalong ada bawa satu anjing...*
3PL exist take one dog
'They had brought a dog...'

(ii) *Lu ada lena la Kwanton ai?*
2SG exist hear EMPH Cantonese INTERROGATIVE
'Do you understand Cantonese?'

5. It should be mentioned that, in addition to so=, "suda" is also found, as well as maw for mo=.
(26) De=ada makan sago.
3SG=be eat sago
'She is eating sago.'

(27) Pe hoe pe=p-ang e tue.
3SG.F sago 3SG.P=3SG.P=eat 3SG.F.be 3SG.F.do
'She is eating sago.'

(28) Lama sakit, de=musti mati.
long.time sick 3SG=must die
'She's been sick for a long time, she's bound to die.'

(29) *Dia mesti mati.

(30) ¡De=musti dudo deng bai.
3SG=must sit with good
'She has to sit properly.'

(31) Lebae de=dudo deng bai.
better 3SG=sit with good
'She should sit properly.'

(32) Dia mesti duduk baik-baik.
3SG must sit RED-good
'She has to sit properly.'

An even greater contrast between standard Indonesian and Papuan Malay is found in the use of aspect marking as a marker of clause linkage. The textual extract in (33) shows an example of tail-head linkage, a very common strategy in discourse in Melanesia. The use of potong in the first clause introduces the sequence of cutting, and the verb in the second clause is unmarked for aspect of any sort or for agreement with the subject. The third clause begins with a copy of the same verb marked with the perfective, but with no verbal agreement. Note that in this stretch of discourse the verbs are all unmarked for agreement, corresponding to the unambiguous identity of the topical subject here and its inanimacy (Donohue & Sawaki 2007). In (34), we can see a series of tail-head linkage patterns of the sort common in New Guinea (Longacre 1972, 1985) but unattested in Standard Indonesian, which owes more of its typological profile to Southeast Asian norms.

(33) Pohon su=tebang, baru tong=molai=potong cabang. Potong cabang itu.
tree PERF=fell new 1PL=start=cut branch cut branch that
so=potong, ambel=de ba=pulang.
PERF=cut fetch=3SG CARRY=return
'When the tree is felled, then we start to cut the branches. [We] cut the branches. When they're all chopped, [we] take them home.'

(34) Dong=nae jalan pi sampe di pondok. Sampe di pondok dongo=duduk isterihat.
3PL=ascend road go until LOC hut until LOC hut 3PL=sit rest
Selasa isterihat dongo=ambe barang pikul ba=pulang di kampong.
complete rest 3PL=fetch thing carry.on.shoulder carry=RETURN LOC village
'They follow the road to the hut. Arriving at the hut, they sit down and rest. After resting, they take their things and carry them back to the village.'
Repetition is a characteristic of discourse in other ways, as in (35), and is not unknown even in other, more standard, varieties of the language, but the use of the tail-head construction to show temporally sequential clauses is distinctive of Papuan Malay (and possibly other colloquial varieties in the east, though this has not been explicitly reported).

(35) *Dong*—*terima deng bai. Dong*—*terima macam bai.*
3PL=receive with good 3PL=receive like good
'They welcome us nicely, they welcome us well.'

3.

More marking of aspect: Serial verb constructions

Additional markers of aspect unique to Papuan Malay include the perfect(ive) use of the verbs *selese* 'finish' and *(h)abis* 'be finished'. *Habis* is confined to main clauses, while *selese* is used in subordinate clauses, as shown in (36).

(36) *So=lapar jadi, maken itu habis.*
PERF=hungry thus eat that finish
'You're hungry, so eat it (all) up.'

(37) *Sesele maken itu, ambe piring ba-pi taru di sana.*
finish eat that take plate carry-go place LOC there
'Afeter eating it up, take your plate and put it over there.'

While *selese* is not in use as a main verb in basilectal Papuan Malay, *habis* has both monovalent and bivalent uses (some speakers, more competent in Standard Indonesian, prefer the Standard Indonesian transitivising suffix -*kan* on the first use of *habis* as a main verb, as in (38)).

(38) *De=bikin rumah habis.*
3SG=make house finish
'He finished building the house.'

(39) *Kalo bagitu tara usa lae, tong=so=habis.*
if like that NEG purpose any more 1PL=PERF=finish
'If that's the case there's no point any more, we're finished.'

(40) *Dong=main bola bukamain. Dong=habis tong=pu anu habis!*
3SG=play soccer amazing 3PL=finish 1PL=POSS child finish
'They're amazing at soccer. They wiped out our team out completely!'

(41) *Dong=so=makan habis.*
3PL=PERF=eat finish
'They've already finished eating.'

4. Serial verb constructions

Serial verb constructions are almost a hallmark of the languages of New Guinea (Foley 1986), and are a prominent feature of Papuan Malay. It is true that examples such as (42), from Singaporean
Malay, attest to the use of serial verbs in western varieties of Malay, but these western varieties show nowhere near the frequency, variety and lexicalisation of serial verbs that is found in Papuan Malay. 6 Note that Standard Indonesian (or Malay) does not employ these constructions, but rather uses the applicative -kan, or the preposition untuk, as in (43) and (44).

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Agent} & \text{Beneficiary} & \text{Theme} \\
42) & \text{Dia buat aku masak nasi.} & \text{Singaporean Malay} \\
& 3sg do.for 1sg cook rice & \text{She cooked (some) rice for me.} \\
\text{Agent} & \text{Beneficiary} & \text{Theme} \\
43) & \text{Dia me-masak-kan saya nasi.} & \text{Standard Indonesian} \\
& 3sg ACT-cook-trans 1sg rice & \text{She cooked me (some) rice.} \\
\text{Agent} & \text{Theme} & \text{Beneficiary} \\
44) & \text{Dia me-masak nasi untuk saya.} & \\
& 3sg ACT-cook rice for 1sg & \text{She cooked me (some) rice.}
\end{array}
\]

We have already seen examples of serialised uses of verbs to mark aspect. Other salient uses of serial verb constructions include:

- adding causers, beneficiaries or instruments;
- describing events involving motion or transfer;
- describing cause-effect complex predicates.

The following sections elaborate on these uses.

4.1 Causers

Causation in Papuan Malay is expressed either lexically, as in such pairs as mawi ‘die’ and bilih ‘kill’ (paralleling the same use in Standard Indonesian), or through the productive causativisers kasi/kas = ‘give’, bikin(g) ‘make’, and buat ‘make, do’. While the bikin(g) and buat constructions

---

6. It might also be noted that the use of serial verb constructions in many western Malay varieties possibly reflects the Sinitic component in the history of colloquial Malay. We note that in Singapore Indian Malay (Sasi 2007), a variety heavily influenced by SOV Tamil, a very different construction is used.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Agent} & \text{Beneficiary} & \text{Theme} \\
41) & \text{Ithu pompan wa pinga pasal nasi masak.} & \text{Singapore Indian Malay} \\
& \text{that woman 1sg mod reason rice cook} & \text{That lady cooked (some) rice for me.} \\
\end{array}
\]

Serial verb constructions are unknown in Standard Malay or Standard Indonesian.
are formed with an independent verb, *kas(i)* is unambiguously a bound form in this construction, though clearly historically and synchronically related to *kasi* 'give'?

*Kasi* may be used with any predicate, agentive or non-agentive and transitive or intransitive. Examples of the basic use of this causative are shown in (45). Compare the Papuan Malay structure with the semantically equivalent translation in Standard Indonesian in (46), and with an equivalent from Skou in (47); Skou is an SOV language in which the causative verb is 'do', which cannot be contiguous with the base predicate.

(45)  a.  *De=su=bangun.*
     3SG=PERF=wake.up  
     'He woke up.'

     b.  *Tong=kas=bangun dia.*
     1PL=CAUS=wake.up 3SG
     'We woke him up.'

(46) *Kami mem-bangun-kan dia.*  
     1PL.EX ACT-wake.up-TRANS 3SG
     'We woke him up.'

(47) *Ke ne=ti ke=lu weng.*  
     3SG.NF 1PL=1PL.do 3SG.NF=eye sleep
     'We put him to sleep.'

Note that, when the base predicate is transitive, there is variation in the form of the causative sentence; the semantic differences associated with the translations do not necessarily reflect the interpretations assigned to the different sentences by speakers, and the degree of variation found might well be dialectal (or idiolectal) as well as being grammatical for the same speaker.

(48) *Ana=tu de=makan papeda.*  
     child=that 3SG=eat sago.porridge
     'The child is eating sago porridge.'

(49) *Mama de=kas=makan de=pu=ana papeda.*  
     mother 3SG=CAUS=eat 3SG=POSS=child sago.porridge
     'That woman is feeding her child sago porridge.'

(50) *Mama de=kas=makan papeda sama de=pu=ana.*  
     mother 3SG=CAUS=eat sago.porridge with 3SG=POSS=child
     'That woman is feeding sago porridge to her child.'

The causativiser *bikin(g)* is found only with intransitive bases and is particularly frequent with non-agentive bases; it might be that *bikin(g)+V* sequences are to some extent lexicalised in the grammar. An object can either appear following the CAUS+verb sequence or intrude between the two elements.

7. Additionally, a wide range of speech verbs may be used with causative functions, as in (i):

(i)  *Sa=suro de=jalan!*  
     1SG=command 3SG=go
     'I told him to go.'
(51) *Jangan de=bikin=takot kau.
don’t 3SG=make=afraid 2SG
‘Don’t let him scare you.’

(52) Jangan de=bikin kau takot.
don’t 3SG=make 2SG afraid
‘Don’t let him scare you.’

Although it is more commonly associated with non-agentive bases, bikin(g) can also be found with agentive predicates:

(53) *Dong=so=bikin=kerja dia.
3PL=PERF=make=work 3SG
‘They’ve made him work.’

For some predicates, bikin(g) is the only commonly accepted causativiser:

(54) De=so=bikin=baik sa=pu=sapu.
3SG=PERF=make=good 1SG=POS=poss=broom
‘She’s fixed my broom.’

(55) ?De=so=kas=baik sa=pu=sapu.
3SG=PERF=give=good 1SG=POS=poss=broom
‘She’s fixed my broom.’

Buat is used for a less “direct” sense of causation, and only allows the causee to appear between the two verbs. Buat is not grammatical in constructions in which it is contiguous with the main verb predicate.

(56) *Dong=buat de=pulang.
3PL=do 3SG=return
‘They made him return home.’ (e.g., because of the things they said, or because they had made him uncomfortable, etc.)

(57) *dong=buat=pulang dia.
3PL=do=return 3SG

Note the contrast in implicature between (58) and (59), in which the causative verb and the base predicate are non-contiguous or contiguous, respectively.

(58) *Dong=kasi de=pulang.
3PL=give 3SG=return
‘They made him return home.’ (e.g., they forced him, or they gave him permission)

(59) Dong=kasi(=pulang dia.
3PL=give=return 3SG
‘They made him return home.’ (they forced him)

As noted earlier, this same verb, buat, is used in different constructions in other varieties of Malay.
It is also highly likely that a non-specialised verb will be used to express the cause in a cause-result construction. The extent to which different collocations have been lexicalised is unknown. Some examples are shown in (60) to (62).

(60) De=kas=mati anjing gonggong itu.
3sg=give=die dog bark that
'He killed the barking dog.'

(61) De=pukol=mati anjing gonggong itu.
3sg=hit=die dog bark that
'He beat the barking dog to death.'

(62) De=potong=mati anjing gonggong itu.
3sg=cut=die dog bark that
'He cut the barking dog so that it died.'

4.2 Beneficiaries

While Standard Indonesian has a simple preposition to indicate beneficiary roles, Papuan Malay employs either "indirect object lowering" (Croft 1985) or a serial verb construction. In the first strategy, the beneficiary is encoded as the possessor of the object of the verb; obviously, this strategy may only be used with bivalent verbs. Thus, in (63) the argument encoded as the possessor of barang baru is interpreted as the beneficiary, and not necessarily (or even primarily) as a possessor.

(63) De=ba=datang sa=pu=barang baru.
3sg=bring=come 1sg=poss=thing new
'He brought some new things for me.' (lit., 'He brought my new things.')

(64) Dong=pana mama pu laului.
3pl=shoot mother poss wallaby
'They shot a wallaby for me.' (elder female speaking, using mama as a 1sg pronoun; lit., 'They shot mother's wallaby."

(65) Harus ko=bikin sa=punya jalan itu.
must 2sg=make 1sg=poss road that
'You've got to build a road for us first, right.'

Alternatively, and obligatorily for a monovalent main predicate, a beneficiary may be encoded as the object of a serial verb construction. The verb used most frequently is kasi 'give', as in (66), but buat 'do' is also heard in this role. Note that in both cases the position of the serial verb is following the main predicate. While buat is used in this same function in some non-standard varieties of Indonesian in the west, it invariably precedes the main verb (as in example (42)), a coding choice that is not available in Papuan Malay.

(66) De=ba=datang barang baru kasi=sa.
3sg=bring=come things new give=1sg
'He brought some new things for me.'
(67) Dong=puna laolao buat mama.
    3PL=shoot wallaby do.for mother
   'They shot a wallaby for me.'

As might be expected from the different glosses given to kasi 'give' and buat 'do for', while kasi requires that any transferable object of the main verb end up in the possession of the object of kasi this is not a necessary entailment of buat. Example (67) is thus ambiguous in interpretation between "mama" receiving the wallaby or (less pragmatically likely) the subject of the clause carrying out the shooting on her behalf. With monovalent main predicates this difference is lost; (68) and (69) are both interpretable only in terms of kitong being the beneficiary of the action.

(68) De=nyangyi kasi kitong.
    3SG=sing give 1PL
   'She sang for us.'

(69) De=nyangyi buat kitong.
    3SG=sing do.for 1PL
   'She sang for us.'

Note that there is not necessarily an entailed transfer of goods when kasi, etymologically derived from 'give', is used. This can be seen in (70).

(70) Sa=mina dia sama banyak kali, tus de=pi kota kasi saya.
    1SG=request 3SG already much time and.then 3SG=go city give 1SG
   'I'd asked her a lot of times, so in the end she went to the city for me.'

As mentioned earlier, colloquial varieties of Malay spoken in the west of the language's range can also use buat to indicate a beneficiary, but in those varieties buat precedes the main predicate. This is not an option in Papuan Malay, as seen in the contrast in grammaticality between (71) and (72).

(71) Dong=ada masak nasi buat kitong.
    3PL=exist cook rice do.for 1PL
   'They're cooking rice for us.'

(72) *?! Dong buat kitong masak nasi

Local languages have constructions equivalent to those seen in Papuan Malay, though not identical. In Skou, there are a great variety of ways of encoding beneficiaries, including one involving indirect object lowering, in which the beneficiary is coded as the possessor of the theme (73); and a strategy in which the possessor appears postverbally, in the position in which most obliques normally appear, with the possessive suffixes that normally mark the possessum being attached directly to the possessor/beneficiary (74).

(73) Ani-ni=ne
    [[bes dì] nalé lang-kè] pe=tue. Skou
    mother-1SG.GEN=1SG.DAT father taro mashed tuber-3SG.NF.Gen 3SG.F=3SG.F.do
   'Mother is making taro lang for father.'
(74) Pe hõe pe=tue [BEM di-kê=ke].
3SG.F sago she=does father 3SG.NILGEN=3SG.NE.DAT
'She’s preparing sago for father.'

Standard Indonesian, by contrast, encodes beneficiaries either prepositionally with *untuk* 'for' or by means of the (applicativising) transitive morphology on the verb (or both; Cole & Son 2004).

(75) Ibu me-masak kue untuk bapak.
n mother ACT-cook cake for father
'Mother made cakes for father.'

(76) Ibu me-masak-kan bapak kue.
n mother ACT-cook-TRANS father cake
'Mother made cakes for father.'

Cross-linguistically there is great variation in the encoding of beneficiaries, and it is no real surprise that Papuan Malay, which has developed as a result of the acquisition of a Malayic lexicon by speakers of languages radically different from those spoken near the Malay homeland far to the west, should have grammaticalised different means of encoding these participants.

4.3 Instruments

A serial verb construction with *pake* 'use' is functionally equivalent to the use of the preposition *sama* 'with' in introducing instruments. The preposition *deng* 'with', etymologically related to the Standard Indonesian *dengan*, is used in some areas, such as Serui (Van Velzen 1995).

(77) Sa=pake parang potong kayu.
1SG=use machete cut wood
'I used a machete [to] cut wood.'

(78) a. Sa=potong kayu sama parang.
b. Sa=potong kayu deng parang.
1SG=cut wood with machete
'I cut wood with a machete.'

(79) Saya men-[p]otong kayu dengan parang.
1SG ACT-cut wood with machete
'I cut wood with a machete.'

A parallel set of alternatives for encoding objects can be found in local languages of the area, shown in (80) to (81).

(80) Ni=pa hõe=ing pe=tue.
sago.stirrer=INSTR sago=the 3SG.F=3SG.F.do
'She [stirs] the sago with a sago stirrer.'

(81) Ni pe=w-ê=ko hõe=ing pe=tue.
sago.stirrer 3SG.F=3SG.F-get=OBV sago=the 3SG.F=3SG.F.do
'She [stirs] the sago with a sago stirrer.'
As with beneficiaries, which frequently show alternations between core argument status and otherwise (e.g., Dative Shift in English and other languages), instruments show a great deal of variation in their encoding, and the serial verb structure that is common in New Guinea, and used in Papuan Malay, is highly iconic from an event structure perspective. It is again not surprising that this structure was adapted into Papuan Malay.

4.4 Motion

The same verb *pake* may also be used to indicate the means of transportation, either in combination with other verbs of motion, or on its own in response to a question.

(82) *Sa=pake prau dayung pi lau mancing ikan.*
    1sg=use canoe paddle go sea catch fish
    'I went by canoe to the sea [to] catch fish.'

(83) a. *Ko=pake apa pi kota?*
    2sg=use what go city
    'How did you get to town?'

b. *Sa=pake motor.*
    1sg=use motorbike
    'I went by motorbike.'

Other serial verb constructions used to express motion predicates involve the combination of manner-of-motion verbs with verbs of directed motion, as seen in (84) and (85). Note that the locative preposition *di* is not usually used in collocation with centripetal motion, though it can be used with centrifugal motion. The allative preposition of Standard Indonesian is not frequently encountered in Papuan Malay.

(84) *De=lari pi skola.*
    3sg=run go school
    'She ran to school.'

(85) *Dong=jalan datang di skola.*
    3pl=walk come loc school
    'They walked to school.'

(86) *Dia lari ke sekolah.*
    3sg run to school
    'She ran to school.'

A verb indicating motion towards a deictic centre may be found following the verb of directed motion. The templatic elaborations of the expression of a motion event are shown in their respective orders in (89).

(87) *De=pigi pulang (di) rumah.*
    3sg=go return loc house
    'She went back home.'
(88) De=datang kemari.
3sg=come hither
'She came back here.'


These constructions can be compared to similar multi-predicate motion-event constructions in Papuan languages of the area, such as Skou.

(90) Pe pe=moe w-a ti p-o te bång. Skou
3sg.f 3sg.f=return 3sg.f=walk running 3sg.f=seawards 3sg.f=go beach
'She ran back down to the beach.'

4.5 Transfer

Serial verb constructions are especially common when the predicate involves motion, in which case direction or means is often added in a serial verb construction. Predicates of giving, transport and communication also frequently involve expression with serial verb constructions. Common examples are shown in Table 3.

Some examples of these collocations can be seen below.

(91) Sa=pu=paca, dong=so=ambe buku ba=pi ruma.
1sg=poss friend 3pl=perf=fetch book carry=go house
'Our friends have taken the books to their houses.'

(92) Jadi sa=punya nenek pigi dong=terima yengan bai.
and.so 1sg=poss grandmother go 3pl=receive with good.
Tru dong=kasi barang-barang de=bawa pulang,
and.then 3pl=give thing=RED 3sg=carry return
'So my grandmother went [there], and they welcomed her heartily. They gave her presents which she took back home.'

For instance, corresponding to the Standard Indonesian verb ambil 'get, take,' Papuan Malay uses the collocation ambe ba(wa)=pergi 'get carry go'. Similarly 'bring' is expressed as ambe ba=datang 'get carry=come'.

(93) De=ambe ba=pergi pulang di ruma.
3sg=get bucket carry=go return loc house
'He took the bucket back home.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papuan Malay</th>
<th>Lexical items</th>
<th>'bring'</th>
<th>'take'</th>
<th>'bring back'</th>
<th>'steal'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ba(wa) datang</td>
<td>carry come</td>
<td>'bring'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba(wa) pigi</td>
<td>carry go</td>
<td></td>
<td>'take'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba(wa) pulang</td>
<td>carry return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'bring back'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambe(l) curi (bawa)</td>
<td>take steal carry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'steal'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(94) *Dia men-bawa ember ke rumah.*

3SG ACT-take bucket to house

'He took the bucket back home.'

The use of a lexically decomposed composition to encode transfer actions correlates with the lack of many lexical distinctions that are present in more western varieties of Malay/Indonesian.

5. Clause linkage

Clause linkage in Papuan Malay differs significantly from Standard Indonesian norms. Some conjunctions from Standard Indonesian such as *dan* 'and', *dengan* 'and, with, while' and *(te/tapi* 'but' are used in much the same way as in Standard Indonesian, albeit with often divergent pronunciations, while other cognate words, such as *terus* 'continue, subsequently' and *baru* 'new, newly' have significant differences. Only the differences that characterise Papuan Malay will be described here.

5.1 Repetition

The strategy of head-tail linkage has already been noted. Example (95) shows an example of classic head-tail linkage. The end of the first sentence encodes the mountain as goal, and the beginning of the following sentence repeats this goal, albeit in a different structure. Note also that the first clause includes repetition of the manner-of-motion verb, a common strategy used to express extent through time.8

(95) *Dong=jalan jalan jalan, pi gunung. Sampe di gunung, dong=so=zapek,*

3PL=walk walk walk go mountain until LOC mountain 3PL=PERF=tired

taramaw jalan lat.

not.want walk again

'They went and went and went, and got to the mountain. When they got to the mountain they were tired, and didn't want to continue.'

In the next example, there is no goal element coded, but simply the repetition of the last predicate. The notation [/] following a clause marks a rising intonation at the end of that clause, showing that the head of the second clause, that element which repeats the previous "tail," is set off prosodically from the rest of its sentence.

8. Similar constructions are used in languages across much of New Guinea and in Tok Pisin, the lingua franca of Papua New Guinea. In all cases, the verb is repeated three times, with a rising intonation contour, followed by either a fourth instance of the verb or another verb, pronounced at a much lower pitch.
(96) Amerika pulang [/], eh, UN yang pegang. UN pegang [/], sekarang Indonesia masuk.
America return ah UN REL hold UN hold now Indonesia enter
Itu saya lihat dengan mata itu.
that 1SG see with eye that
'So America left [to go] back home, and the UN took over. After the UN took over, well, now Indonesia’s here. This I have seen with my own eyes.'

This distinct and consistent prosodic marker is evidence that the head-tail linkage pattern cannot be considered to be a disfluency, but is a deliberate and conventionalised speech device.

5.2 Conjunctions

The conjoining of clauses follows different patterns from those seen in Standard Indonesian. Many clauses are conjoined by simple juxtaposition, with no overt conjunction being used. This is a pattern found in many varieties of non-standard Malay across the whole archipelago, and so should not be considered unique to Papuan Malay. One extract showing this is in (97), where an "expected" conjunction (from the perspective of Standard Indonesian) is shown with Ø.

(97) Ambil hasil itu Ø saya suda habis ya [clap] kapur, suda hilang artinya Ø
fetch finish that 1SG already finish yes lime already lost the meaning
de=pu=uang so=habis, Ø de=so=hilang,
3SG=POS=money PERF=finish 3SG=PERF=lost
"They'll take the produce, and when my [goods] are finished, well, [clap], like the lime [for betel chewing] is finished, or the money for them is used up, they'll take off.'

This can be compared to the Standard Indonesian example expressing the same meaning in (97):

(97') Mereka mengambi hasil-nya, jika hasil-nya sudah habis, STANDARD INDONESIAN
3PL ACT-take result-3GEN, if result-3GEN PERF finish,
umpama-nya kapur sudah habis, ataupagi uang untuk mereka
example-3GEN lime PERF finish or.in.addition money for 3PL
sudah habis, langsung mereka akan pergii.
PERF finish straight.away 3PL will go.
"They'll take the produce, and when the produce is all finished, for instance if the lime is all used up, or the money for them is finished, then straight away they'll go (away).'

5.2.1 Jadi

Jadi 'become', which functions as an inchoative marker, is used to conjoin clauses with the same semantics as its Standard Indonesian counterpart, though the syntax is quite different. Jadi can appear in the same position as in Standard Indonesian, such as in (98).

(98) Dong=so=datang, jadi popeda musti siap.
3PL=PERF=come and.so sago.pudding must ready
"They'd already arrived, so the sago jelly had to be [made] ready.'
It is more common, however, to find jadi as a sentence-final particle indicating the reason for the sentence.

(99) Sa=tra=ikot. Sa=capek jadi.
1SG=NEG=accompany 1SG=tired and so
‘I’m not coming along. It’s ‘cos I’m tired.’

(100) Jadi skarang tong=bilang [click], kita harus mina itu orang asing.
and.so now 1PL=say 1SG must request that person foreign
‘So now we’re saying, yeah, I’ve got to ask foreigners [about it].’

Clearly there is an assumed prior proposition: Sentence (99) could not be uttered without some foregoing discussion of work that needs to be done.

A second use of jadi is as a new topic marker, often in conjunction with itu ‘that’.

(101) Jadi orang rambut luarus, biasa tara=taw jalan.
and.so person hair straight normally NEG=know walk
‘So the Indonesians, they don’t usually know how to walk [in the jungle].’

(102) Jadi Belanda datang itu, say masih mudah.
and.so Holland come that 1SG still young
‘So when the Dutch arrived, I was still young.’

5.2.2 Baru and trus

Baru ‘new(by)’ is used as a conjunction with clauses in connected speech, somewhat similar to lalu in varieties of Indonesian further west.

As noted by De Vries (1989), there is a contrastive use of baru in some varieties of Papuan Malay, to indicate switch reference. While De Vries discusses certain varieties of South Papuan Malay, the same comments apply to many northern varieties as well, where it operates in opposition to the conjunction trus ‘and then’, sometimes reduced to tus. Trus is a commonly used connective when there is a same-subject coreference condition between clauses, and when some, but not much, time has elapsed between the events in the two clauses.

The same-subject conditions on trus can be seen in the contrast between (103) and (104), in which (104) is at best barely grammatical.

(103) Sa=pukol=de, tus sa=lari habis.
1SG=hit=3SG new 1SG=run finish
‘I hit him, and then I ran away.’

(104) */ Sa=pukol=de, tus de=lari habis.
1SG=hit=3SG new 3SG=run finish
‘I hit him, and then he ran away.’

Clauses conjoined with baru show a strong preference for the opposite interpretation, with the two subjects not being coreferential.

(105) Sa=pukol=de, baru de=lari habis.
1SG=hit=3SG new 3SG=run finish
‘I hit him, and then he ran away.’
(106) "* Sa=pukol=de, baru sa=lari habis.
   1sg=hit=3sg new 1sg=run finish
   'I hit him, and then I ran away.'

When two arguments of the verb are both third person, the utility of the opposition between baru and trus becomes apparent, as in the interpretations of (107) and (108).

(107) Pace=tu, orang nikra kutuk, baru de=tariak.
   friend=that person sorcery curse new 3sg=yell
   'My friend, the sorcerer, cursed [him] and then he cried out.'

(108) Pace=tu, orang nikra kutuk, tus de=tariak.
   friend=that person sorcery curse and then 3sg=yell
   'My friend, the sorcerer, cursed [him] and then he cried out.'

Both of these conjunctions can be, and frequently are, used at the beginning of a clause. In (109), we can see trus starting a clause describing what happened immediately after the graduation from school. In (110), we see an interclausal use of baru, while in (111) baru, in conjunction with itu, appears at the start of a new sentence. Notice how the inclusive reference of the subject from the first clause with the larger subject of the second clause does not license the use of trus.

(109) De=selesai sekola. Trus, de=mo=cari uang di kota jadi,
   3sg=complete school and then 3sg=IRR=search money loc city and so
   de=so=pinda dari sini.
   3sg=PERF=move from here
   'He finished school. Then, because he wanted to make some money, he moved away from here.'

(110) Kita so=jadi baru de=serita tadi.
   1pl PERF=become new 3sg=story before
   'When we had been born, then she'd tell us about before.'

(111) Dong=terima macam bai. Itu baru kitorang baku kasi.
   3pl=receive like good that new 1pl mutual give
   'They receive [us] well. So, like, we exchange gifts.'

In Skou, the equivalents of trus and baru are the enclitics =pa and =ko, though, like Papuan Malay, Skou also allows for zero conjunction, as in (112). In (113) and (114), we can see that, with the same third-person feminine subject in Ang pe we as in (pe) pú moe te pá, the instrumental enclitic, which marks same reference, must be used. By contrast, (115) and (116) show that when the subjects of the two clauses are not identical =ko 'obviative' must be used to link them.

(112) Hoe pe=tue, Theo ke=k-ang.
   sago 3sg.F=D=3sg.F=do 'Theo 3sg.NF=3sg.NF=eat
   'She cooked the sago, [and] Theo ate [it].'

(113) Ang pe=w-é=pa pú moe te pá.
   dry.wood 3sg.F=E=3sg.F-get=INST 3sg.F=carry return 3sg.F=go house
   'She collected the firewood and then carried it back home.'
(114) *Ang pe=w-ŋko pú moe te pá.
  dry.wood 3SG.F=3SG.F-get=OVB 3SG.R=carry return 3SG.R=go house
  'She collected the firewood and then carried it back home.'

(115) Høe pe=tue=ko, Theo ke=k-ang.
  sago 3SG.F=3SG.R.do=OVB Theo 3SG.NF=3SG.NF-cat
  'She cooked the sago, and then Theo ate [it].'

(116) *Høe pe=tue=pa, Theo ke=k-ang.
  sago 3SG.F=3SG.R.do=INSTR Theo 3SG.NF=3SG.NF-cat
  'She cooked the sago, and then Theo ate [it].'

The use of baru and trus with implications for the coreferential identity of subjects across the two clauses that are conjoined is perhaps one of the strongest marks of the explicitly Papuan (that is, non-Austronesian) influence on Papuan Malay. This kind of clause-linkage device is unknown in Austronesian languages, except those heavily influenced by Papuan languages in New Guinea.

6. Other clausal restructuring

A feature of Papuan Malay is the frequency with which non-subject arguments are topicalised. Topicalisation is a grammatical strategy in western varieties of Indonesian as well, but not with the frequency with which it occurs in Papuan Malay; in some texts, over half of the bivalent clauses with nominal objects have those arguments in preverbal position.

(117) Babi=tu(,) sa=so=lia.
  pig=that 1SG=PERF=see
  'That pig, I've already seen.'

(118) Tapi jalan dong=taramaw bikin.
  but road 3PL=not.want make
  'But they won't want to make a road.'

It is more than likely that this is an adaptive strategy that allows the OV order of the substrate languages in New Guinea (see examples in (7) and (8) earlier) to surface in what is nominally a VO language, Papuan Malay.

7. Conclusion

We have seen that, in a number of ways, Papuan Malay more closely replicates the structures of local Papuan languages than it does other varieties of Malay, representing its lexifier language(s). Table 4 summarises the material that has been discussed in this chapter.

Should Papuan Malay be considered to be a language of New Guinea or a variety of Indonesian/Malay? The question of affiliations is always problematic with pidgins and creoles, but it is certainly strained to consider Papuan Malay to be a representative of an Austronesian speech tradition in any respect except the actual lexemes. The sort of complete restructuring of the clause
Table 4. Comparing Papuan Malay with superstrate and substrate languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Indonesian</th>
<th>Papuan Malay</th>
<th>Local Papuan languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal morphology</td>
<td>voice, derivational affixes</td>
<td>aspect, agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique arguments</td>
<td>prepositional</td>
<td>prepositional, serial verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense/Aspect</td>
<td>independent words</td>
<td>verbal morphology, serial verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause linkage</td>
<td>coordinating and subordinating words</td>
<td>tail-head linkages, switch reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and sentence that we have seen evidenced in this chapter suggests that we should consider the substrate language(s), rather than the superstrate language, to more accurately represent the speech traditions that are continued in Papuan Malay.

List of abbreviations

1, 2, 3 first, second and third person
ACT active
ALL allative
CAUS causative
DAT dative
EMPH emphatic
EX exclusive
F feminine
GEN genitive
IN inclusive
INSTR instrumental
IRR irrealis
LOC locative
M masculine
MOD modifier
NEG negative
NF non-feminine
NONACT non-active
OBV obviative
PERF perfective
PL plural
POSS possessive
RED reduplicant
REL relative
SG singular
TRANS transitive
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